



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,665	11/04/2003	Christophe Gustave	ALC 3096	6478

7590 08/22/2007
KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.
Suite 240
1725 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

SANDOVAL, KRISTIN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2132

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/22/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/699,665

Applicant(s)

GUSTAVE ET AL.

Examiner

Kristin D. Sandoval

Art Unit

2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 May 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 2 and 4-12 are pending. Claim 3 is cancelled.

Drawings

2. The drawings were received on May 24, 2007. These drawings are accepted.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2 and 4-6 have been considered but are not persuasive in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments filed May 24, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive with regard to claims 7-12. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., create a stack that varies based on a provided authentication domain identifier) are not recited in the rejected claim(s) 7. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Claim 7 recites the limitation, "means, at the authentication server and **depending** on the authentication domain identifier, for creating an authentication stack comprising one or more stack entries (emphasis added)." This limitation does not state that the stack itself varies based on the domain identifier. Ferchichi discloses creating an authentication stack based upon the presence of a domain identifier (paragraphs 0106) which falls well within the scope of claim 7.

Art Unit: 2132

Applicant further argues that Ferchichi fails to disclose consolidating authentication results to obtain an authentication status for the end-user client. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Ferchichi discloses consolidating the result of the username password authentication and the smartcard desynchronization state in order to authenticate the user (paragraph 0221).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1 and 2 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Patrick, U.S. 7,017,051.

As per claim 1:

Patrick discloses a method of authenticating end-user clients requiring access to services available in a computer-based communication system, comprising the steps of:

- a) at an authentication server connected in said communication system, defining a list of authentication modules available in said communication system, and mapping said authentication modules to authenticating, domain identifiers associated to end-user clients of said authentication server (2:60-67, 3:1-3);
- b) sending, by an end-user client, respective authentication domain identifier to said authentication server (3:5-7, 10:56-59);

Art Unit: 2132

c) creating, by the authentication server and depending on the authentication domain identifier, an authentication stack specific to said end-user client, said stack comprising one or more stack entries, each mapped to a respective authentication module (3:18-34);

d) rendering, for each stack entry and depending thereon, an authentication service provided at said respective authentication module to produce an authentication result for that entry (3:35-45); and

e) consolidating authentication results to obtain an authentication status for the end-user client (9:32-50).

As per claim 2:

Patrick further discloses a method wherein the authentication domain identifier identifies an application service ID (8:39-53).

5. Claims 7, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ferchichi et al. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0012382 A1, (hereinafter “Ferchichi”).

6. Regarding claims 7: Ferchichi discloses a method (Title) and system ([0048] module can include hardware and software) respectively, of authenticating an end-user client in a computer-based communication system comprising the steps of:

a) sending, by the end-user client, an authenticating domain identifier to an authentication server ([0012] – [0015] request);

b) creating, by the authentication server and depending on the authentication domain identifier, an authentication stack comprising one or more stack entries ([0012] – [0015] store request);

c) rendering, for each stack entry and depending thereon, an authentication service to produce an authentication result for that entry ([0012] – [0015] check authentication mode); and

d) consolidating authentication results to obtain an authentication status for the end-user client ([0221] synchronization status).

7. **Regarding claims 4 and 10:** Ferchichi discloses that the authentication service includes local and remote services ([0049] – [0050] local authentication via single sign on module required for authentication for remote access).

8. **Regarding claims 5 and 11:** Ferchichi discloses that the local and remote services include biometric schemes ([0048] – [0050]), cryptographic hardware services ([0048] and [0064] cryptographic hardware), smart cards ([0048] – [0050]), and USB tokens (0061] token).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 4 and 5 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patrick in view of Ferchichi.

Art Unit: 2132

10. **Regarding claim 4:** Patrick substantially teaches local authentication services, but fails to disclose remote services (3:35-45). However, Ferchichi discloses that the authentication service includes remote services ([0049] – [0050] local authentication via single sign on module required for authentication for remote access). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to substitute a remote authentication service for a local authentication service.

Regarding claim 5: Patrick fails to disclose local and remote authentication services including biometrics, cryptographic hardware, smart cards and USB tokens. Ferchichi discloses that the local and remote services include biometric schemes ([0048] – [0050]), cryptographic hardware services ([0048] and [0064] cryptographic hardware), smart cards ([0048] – [0050]), and USB tokens (0061] token). It would have been obvious to utilize biometric schemes, cryptographic hardware services, smart cards and USB tokens as authentication services since, used on their own, they would yield the same result. Therefore, the combination of Patrick and Ferchichi would yield predictable results.

11. Claim 6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patrick in view of Saigo et al. (Saigo), U.S. Patent No. 6,587,880.

Regarding claim 6: Patrick fails to teach a method comprising sending a unique session identifier to the end-user client responsive to an authentication status corresponding to a successful authentication. However, Saigo discloses transmitting a session identifier to the user upon successful authentication (8:52-67). It would have been obvious to combine the inventions

Art Unit: 2132

of Patrick and Saigo since transmitting a session identifier to the user upon successful authentication yields the same result of an authenticated user obtaining a session identifier.

12. Claims 8, 9, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferchichi in view of Shimada et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0154373 A1, (hereinafter “Shimada”).

13. Regarding claim 8: Ferchichi does not disclose that the authentication identifies an application ID. Shimada discloses that the authentication identifies an application ID ([0040] – [0041] authentication dependent on application).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ferchichi by application dependent parameters as taught by Shimada in order to enable services to operate on a variety of platforms, (*see* Shimada [0040]).

14. Regarding claim 9: Ferchichi does not disclose that the authentication server, dependent on the application ID, retrieves a configuration specifying authentication application, which configuration is used for creating the authentication stack.

Shimada discloses that the authentication server, dependent on the application ID, retrieves a configuration specifying authentication application, which configuration is used for creating the authentication stack ([0040] configuration depends on application and device).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ferchichi by application dependent parameters as taught by Shimada in order to enable services to operate on a variety of platforms, (*see* Shimada [0040]).

15. **Regarding claim 12:** Ferchichi does not disclose that, responsive to an authentication status corresponding to a successful authentication, a unique session ID is sent to the end-user client.

Shimada discloses that, responsive to an authentication status corresponding to a successful authentication, a unique session ID is sent to the end-user client ([0457] session ID associated with user).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ferchichi by application dependent parameters as taught by Shimada in order to enable services to operate on a variety of platforms, (*see* Shimada [0040]).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2132

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristin D. Sandoval whose telephone number is 571-272-7958. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KDS
KDS

Kristin D Sandoval
Examiner
Art Unit 2132


GILBERTO BARRON JR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100